



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

#23
2-8-2
Robert-
Reply
Brief

RECEIVED
FEB - 7 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

In re the application of:

Masuo OHNISHI et al.

Serial Number: 09/184,878

Group Art Unit: 2835

Filed: November 3, 1998

Examiner: I. FEILD

For: **ELECTRONIC APPARATUS AND DISK
UNIT MOUNTING MECHANISM**

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

February 4, 2002

Sir:

This brief is in reply to the Examiner's Answer dated December 4, 2001 (Paper No. 21).

1. In regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 5, 6, 7/5, 7/6, 8/5, 8/6, 9/5, 9/6, 15/5, 15/6, 20, 21, 30/5, 30/6 and 31/21 as anticipated by Hager et al., Appellants would like to emphasize that the mount 68 of Hager et al. does not have the function of the vibration and/or shock absorbing member of the present invention.

The mount 68 of Hager et al. appears to serve as a fixing member used when the housing 14 and the disk drive are assembled in an engaging manner through one-touch handling. The vibration and/or shock absorbing member of the present invention serves to absorb an impact

Reply Brief
Noted
[Signature]

that is transferred between an interior frame of electrical equipment and a disk drive when the electrical equipment is subjected to shaking at the time of hand-carrying. Hager et al. does not disclose nor suggest such a function of the mount 68.

Therefore, Appellants submit that the mount 68 of Hager et al. cannot be equated to the vibration and/or shock absorbing member of the present invention. Accordingly, Hager et al. fails to disclose simultaneous use of different vibration and/or shock absorbing members made of different materials, as in the present invention.

2. In regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 14/1, 14/4, 14/5, 14/6, 15/1, 15/4, 16/1, 16/4, 16/5, 16/6, 17/1, 17/4, 17/5, 17/6, 18, 19 and 24-29 as unpatentable over Varghese et al. in view of Genix et al., Appellants would like to emphasize that the PC board 22 of Genix et al. corresponds to the PT plate that is mounted in the disk drive 10 of Varghese et al. Appellants respectfully submit that it is unreasonable to combine an insulating structure of the PT plate with the plate 62 that is a metal plate located outside the disk drive in Varghese et al. in consideration of the functions and roles of these plates.

In view of the aforementioned arguments, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is therefore respectfully requested to reverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and compel the Examiner to allow all claims on appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP



William L. Brooks
Reg. No. 34,129
Attorney for Appellants

Attorney Docket No. 981331

Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
Tel: (202) 659-2930

WLB/nrp
Q:\FLOATERS\Wlb\981331 Reply Brief.frm